DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 040 949 SP 003 996

AUTHOR Planz, Charles A.; Gibson, R. Oliver
TITLE Perceived Equity and Its Relationship to Attrition Among Early Career Male Teachers.
PUB DATE Mar 70
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at annual meeting, AERA, Minneapolis, 1970

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.45
DESCRIPTORS *Differentiated Staffs, Job Satisfaction, Males, *Teacher Persistence, Teachers, *Teacher Salaries

ABSTRACT

A study explored these questions: 1) Are there significant differences in perceived equity (equitable exchange situation of rewards to teachers in return for their contributions) between those who teach in a Type 1 school (with a traditional staffing arrangement) and those in a Type 2 school (with differentiated staffing and more differentiated rewards)? 2) Are these significant differences in perceived equity between those who leave teaching (in less than 5 years) and those who remain (for more than 5)? Subjects (all males) were 26 stayers and 20 leavers from a Type 1 school district, 24 stayers and 35 leavers from a Type 2 district, both demographically similar, contiguous districts in the same town. Questionnaire responses, regarding aspirations in his school system and opportunity provided to reach them, were rated on a Likert type scale to measure perceived equity. Two hypotheses were tested using a two-way factorial analysis of variance. Both were confirmed: The stayers perceived a significantly higher degree of equity than the leavers, and the Type 2 stayers perceived a significantly higher degree of equity than Type 1 stayers. Other findings indicated no significant relationship between perceived equity and these factors: type of institution from which the respondent graduated, length of teaching experience, teaching level, socio economic status, and educational attainment. (Additional findings and research suggestions are included.) (JS)

ED040949

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PERCEIVED EQUITY AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO ATTRITION AMONG EARLY CAREER MALE TEACHERS

PAPER PRESENTED TO THE AMERICAN EDUCATION RESEARCH ASSOCIATION
MARCH 6, 1970 MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

Charles A. Planz
Evaluator
Project UNIQUE
Rochester, New York

R. Oliver Gibson
Department Chairman
Educational Administration
S.U.N.Y. at Buffalo

SP003996

Introduction

Despite both the relative and absolute gain of teachers' salaries in comparison to the rising income for other occupational groups during the ten year period from 1955-65,[1] The attrition rate of first year male teachers remains consistently high at approximately 12%[2] in respect to the national teacher attrition rate of only 8%[3].

With approximately 150,000 teachers leaving the profession annually, the problem of retention is of major importance to school administrators.[4] Attrition of early career teachers is of utmost significance since this group represents those individuals most recently trained to enter the profession. Mason found that 51% of beginning classroom teachers did not expect to be teaching five years later.[5] Charters concluded that by far the poorest survival risks are teachers in their first and second years in the school. "If a teacher survives five years he will survive almost idefinitely."[6] One possible method of decreasing attrition among male teachers is the adoption of a career ladder with promotional opportunities within the classroom, thus increasing work and reward differentiation.

Assumptions

In order to determine if there were any association between teacher attrition and staff differentiation in a school, several assumptions were postulated. Once the occupational choice has been made by individuals to enter the teaching profession it was assumed that for some preceived status and economic inequities were strongly associated with leaving the profession.

For the purpose of this study, it seemed reasonable to assume that if a school system provides an equitable exchange situation of rewards to teachers in return for their contributions, upon bases such as performance and level of education, these teachers will be likely to remain in such a situation. Conversely, those who perceive the system as having little equity in the distribution of economic and status rewards will be more likely to leave the system and teaching. Teachers who perceive the situation as providing economic and status rewards in return for their contributions to the system are rather likely to remain in the system.

It was also assumed that a school system which has more differentiated rewards associated in the differentiated roles such as teacher, team teacher and team leader and has allowed teachers to move from one level to the next provides a more equitable exchange relationship in comparison to a school with less differentiated rewards with no team teaching and a lock-step salary schedule. Thus, there should be differences in the perception of equity between those teachers who teach in a team teaching system in comparison to those who teach in a less differentiated system.

Schools with a traditional staffing arrangement are referred to as a Type I school. Schools which had a differentiated staff are referred to as Type II Schools.

The following questions were studied:

1. Are there significant differences in perceived equity between those who teach in a Type I school and those who teach in a Type II School?

2. Are there significant differences in perceived equity of rewards and contributions between those who leave teaching and those who remain in teaching?

Conceptual Framework

A useful framework for viewing the reward system in a school can be constructed by integrating the concepts of equity and social exchange. Formal concepts of equity based on relative rewards and contributions have been developed independently by Patchen,[7] Homans,[8] and Adams.[9] The social exchange theory of contributions and rewards in an organization has been developed by Parsons and Smelser[10] and Blau.[11] Parsons, Smelser and Blau contend the attractiveness of a work role for a person is inversly related to the extent to which it provides him with aversive outcomes. The employment relationship between a teacher and the organization can be viewed as an exchange process in which the teacher exchanges his services for various rewards from the school system.

Basic to this position is the notion that individuals are guided by a moral system of "distributive justice" which has as a basic tenet the fair or equitable distribution of rewards. If a person receives less than a fair amount, he feels that an injustice has been done him. In effect this conception of equitable distribution of rewards would relate job satisfaction as a function of the amount of difference between the amount of reward that a person perceives he should receive and the amount of reward he actually receives. The greater the difference between these two amounts, the greater the "tension" or "disequilibrium" experienced by the individual.

Jacques found evidence for the state of disequilibrium which he assumes to be created by disparities between equitable and actual levels of payment. He summarizes his findings as follows:

> If the actual salary bracket for a person's role coincides with equity, he expresses himself as being in a reasonably paid role. If his actual payment bracket has fallen below the equitable bracket, he expresses himself as dissatisfied with the financial recognition of his role. The intensity of his reaction varies with the size of the discrepancy between actual and equitable brackets.[12]

Adams' concept of equity and its opposite inequity is analogous to March and Simon's theory of inducement contribution of Zaleznik, Christensen and Roethlisberger's reward-investment index.[13] Inequity primarily results from discrepancies in the relative magnitudes of rewards and investments of a person and those of other persons with whom he compares himself. An individual's perception of the rewards and investment of others is thought to provide him with a standard against which he judges the fairness and equity of rewards which he himself receives.

In this exchange process, on the teacher's side of the ledger are his inputs which include education, experience, subject speciality, performance, social status, job effort and relations with his fellow teachers. On the school's side of the exchange process are the outcomes of rewards provided the teacher for his inputs. These include pay, rewards intrinsic to the job, seniority benefits, fringe benefits and status symbols.

In both school districts, the names of all male teachers under 35 years of age who had taught at least five years constituted one population labeled "stayers." The second population included all male teachers who had taught

in the two systems and had left the two systems since 1965. This group was labeled "leavers."

Hypotheses

In studying the relationships the following were proposed as hypotheses:

H_1 The "stayers" will perceive a significantly higher degree of equity than the "leavers."

H_2 "Stayers" in Type II School will perceive a significantly higher degree of equity than "stayers" in Type I school.

Several conditional variables were related to equity and were studied:

Q_1 Is there a significant relationship between perceived equity and socio-economic status?

Q_2 Is there a significant relationship between perceived equity and length of graduate training?

Q_3 Is there a significant relationship between perceived equity and length of service?

Q_4 Is there a significant relationship between perceived equity and teaching level (elementary vs. secondary)?

Q_5 Is there a significant relationship between perceived equity and type of college attended?

Procedures

The populations in this study were selected from two demographically similar school districts which exhibited Type I and Type II characteristics. Both districts were located in the same town, contiguous and rapidly growing districts. Both districts were middle class socio-economically, although Type II district had a somewhat higher socio-economic status. The weighted average daily pupil attendance of Type I district was approximately 6,000 compared to 8,900 for Type II district. Local financial support for education

was quite similar with nearly identical full value tax rates, approved operating expenditures and amount raised locally for education.

In order to measure perceived equity a questionnaire developed by Pelz and Andrews[14] was used and adapted for the participants in the study. In the first part of the instrument participants were asked to indicate what their aspirations are (were) in the school system in which they taught. Responses to these questions were ranked on a Likert Scale ranging from little importance to utmost importance. With the same items the question was asked "How much opportunity is provided in your school system to reach aspirations?" Again the answer was recorded on a Likert type Scale ranging from 1-5 (little importance to utmost importance). The discrepancy between the total score on the first set of items and the total score on the second set of items provides an equity score. The greater the discrepancy between aspiration and provision, the lower the perceived equity of the respondent. Conversely, the smaller the discrepancy between aspiration and provision, the higher the perceived equity on behalf of the respondent.

It was felt that each factor may have a different level of importance in the decision to remain in or leave teaching. For each set of items the question was asked: "What affect does (did) each one of these factors have in your decision to remain (or leave) teaching?" To determine these priorities a technique used by Howell, Brumback, Newman and Rizzo was utilized.[15] These researchers were concerned with the dimensions of work satisfaction and behavioral indices of retention of physicians employed by the U.S. Public Health Service. They state that the Effect on Decision Scale is similar to measures of "importance" which had been studied as a means of estimating the effect of any work aspect on overall satisfaction.

Findings

Of the 113 total population drawn from the records of school districts I and II, 95 teachers or former teachers were interviewed by means of telephone during the months of March and April, 1969. This represented an 84% respondent reply to the interview via telephone.

Table I indicates the total number of "stayers" and "leavers" in school districts I and II who were interviewed.

TABLE I

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS IN EACH CELL

	Stayers	Leavers	Total
Type I School	26	20	46
Type II School	24	25	49
Total	50	45	95

Table 2 presents the means of each cell along with the standard deviations of each group score on the equity scale.

Table 2

CELL MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
OF STAYERS AND LEAVERS
IN TYPE I AND TYPE II SCHOOLS

	Type I	Type II	Total
Stayers	$\bar{x}$=4.81 σ=9.44	$\bar{x}$=.25 σ=8.10	$\bar{x}$=2.62
Leavers	$\bar{x}$=17.95 σ=10.91	$\bar{x}$=8.76 σ=12.47	$\bar{x}$=12.84
Total	$\bar{x}$=10.52	$\bar{x}$=4.59	

Table 2 indicates there is a difference in means between the present teachers at Type I and II school districts. Teachers at Type II school with an average perceived equity score of .25 have a very high degree of perceived equity. Teachers in Type I school district had an average percieved equity of 4.81 which would indicate that they did not perceive as high a degree of equity as teachers in Type II school district.

When comparing all the "stayers" with all the "leavers", it is evident that those teachers remaining in their positions perceived a higher degree of equity ($\bar{x}$=2.62) than those teachers who left the systems ($\bar{x}$=12.84).

To determine if these differences were significant at the .05 level of confidence the following analysis of variance (ANOVA) table was constructed. The fact that the standard deviations obtained were quite similar in value to one another implied that the use of analysis of variance was appropriate to test the hypotheses.

Hypothesis I was tested using a two way factorial analysis of variance with unequal cell size. The following analysis of variance table indicates that hypothesis I cannot be rejected at the .05 level.

TABLE 3

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE FOR EQUITY (N=95)

Source	d.f.	Mean Square	F	D
Schools (Type I and II)	1	843.3	7.80	.01
Status (Stayer and leavers)	1	2713.3	25.37	.0001
Interaction	1	126.1	1.18	Not significant
Error	91	106.9		
	94			

Hypothesis 1 stated that the "stayers" perceive a higher degree of equity than the "leavers". This hypothesis was confirmed when the null form of the hypothesis was rejected at the .0001 level.

Hypothesis 2 was tested using a t test of significance

Where $t = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{S_{\bar{x}1} - \bar{x}_2}$ and Where $S_{\bar{x}1} - \bar{x}_2 = \sqrt{\frac{S_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{S_2^2}{N_2}}$

Hypothesis 2 stated "stayers" at Type II school percieve a higher degree of equity than "stayers" at Type I school. This hypothesis cannot be rejected at the .05 level. With 48 degree of freedom, an obtained t value 1.68 is significant. The obtained t was 1.86. The null form of the hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level, thus confirming the hypothesis.

Table 3 indicates that all the respondents at Type I had a significantly different perceived equity than all the respondents at Type II school. This difference was significant at the .01 level of confidence.

Also, the analysis of variance table indicates that there is no significant interaction effect between schools (Type I or Type II) and status ("stayers" or "leavers"). "Stayers" and "leavers" behave the same way in terms of equity in both schools, although the levels of perceived equity are different for both schools.

A Pearson Product Correlation was used between all the respondents equity score and the five major independent variables. Table 4 is the correlation matrix between perceived equity and the five major independent variables. With 94 degrees of freedom a $p > .202$ is a significant correlation. Significant correlations were not consistent for each of the four cells.

TABLE 4

CORRELATION MATRIX BETWEEN EQUITY AND DEPENDENT VARIABLES

	1. Equity	2 Institution	3 Experience	4 Teaching Level	5 Socio-Economic Status	6 Educational Attainment	7 Principal's Rating	8 Degree of Certainty
1. Equity	1.000							
2. Institution	.148	1.000						
3. Experience	-.053	.029	1.000					
4. Teaching Level	.119	.458*	.087	1.000				
5. Socio-Economic Status	-.046	-.050	.171	-.004	1.000			
6. Educational Attainment	.022	.300*	.297	.257*	.030	1.000		
7. Principal's Rating	.272*	-.045	-.225*	-.052	.044	-.331*	1.000	
8. Degree of Certainty	-.338*	-.006	.000	.058	-.196	.154	-.133	1.000

*$\rho >$ .202 is a significant correlation

Research Question I asked if there were a significant relationship between perceived equity and type of institution from which the respondent graduated. A correlation of .138 indicated that there is no difference between type of institution (Liberal Arts College or Teacher Training College) from which the respondent graduated and perceived equity. Only the Type I "leavers" had a significant correlation with this variable i.e. those who had graduated from a teacher training institution had perceived significantly greater equity than those who had graduated from a liberal arts college.

Research Question 2 asked if there were a significant relationship between perceived equity and length of teaching experience. A correlation of .053 indicated there is no significant difference between those teachers with little teaching experience (1-5 years) or greater teaching experience (11-15 years) and perceived equity.

Research Question 3 asked if there were a significant relationship between perceived equity and teaching level (elementary or secondary). A correlation of .119 indicates that there is no significant relationship between perceived equity and teaching level. Only the Type I "leavers" had a significant correlation with this variable. For this group there was a direct relationship between equity and teaching at the elementary level.

Research Question 4 asked if there were a significant relationship between perceived equity and scio-economic status (low, middle, or high). A correlation of - .046 indicates there is no significant relationship between perceived equity and socio-economic status.

Research Question 5 asked if there were a significant relationship between perceived equity and educational attainment (B.A. degree M.A. degree or M.A. + 30 hours). A correlation of .022 indicates there is no significant relationship between perceived equity and educational attainment.

Additional Findings

Each principal in both school districts was interviewed and asked to evaluate the performance of the teachers in their school who participated in the study. Principals were asked to evaluate the respondents performance as above average, average, or below average in comparison to all other teachers in their school. All of the respondents were rated by their principals.

In Table 5 the evaluation of teachers performance as indicated by their principals is presented. Teachers were classified as either below average, average, or above average by their principals.

TABLE 5

PRINCIPAL'S EVALUATION OF TEACHERS PERFORMANCE

	Below Average Performance	Average Performance	Above Average Performance
Type I - Leavers	4	10	6
Stayers	1	11	14
TOTAL	5	21	20
Type II- Leavers	7	8	10
Stayers	1	5	18
TOTAL	8	13	28

Those teachers who were rated below average by their principal were mostly (11 of 13) "leavers". Whereas only two of the teachers who were still teaching received a below average rating.

A correlation of .272 was obtained when the principal ratings were correlated with the perceived equity score of each teacher. This is a significant correlation at the .05 level of confidence. Teachers who were rated below average

by their principals tended to have a high equity score or low perceived equity. Those teachers who were rated above average by their principals had a low equity scores or a high degree of perceived equity.

Another finding dealt with the degree of certainty teachers had about receiving any type of recognition, promotion or reward for their performance as a teacher.

Table 6 indicates the certainty teachers had about receiving any type of recognition, promotion or reward for their performance as a teacher. The responses on the Likert type scale ranged from none, little, some, high or utmost certainty.

TABLE 6

DEGREE TO WHICH RESPONDENTS WERE CERTAIN OF BEING REWARDED, RECOGNIZED OR PROMOTED FOR THEIR PERFORMANCE

	Degree of Certainty				
	None	Little	Some	High	Utmost
Type I - Leavers	6	3	5	6	0
Stayers	4	7	7	5	3
TOTAL	10	10	12	11	3
Type II -Leavers	5	6	3	6	5
Stayers	2	2	3	14	3
TOTAL	7	8	6	20	8

In district I only 14 respondents (30%) indicated that there was high or utmost certainly about being rewarded for their performance. Respondents in district II indicated high or utmost certainty about being rewarded numbered 28 or 59%. Thus, teachers in district II were almost twice as certain about being rewarded in comparison to district I.

A correlation of -.339 was obtained when the perceived equity was related to degree of certainly about being rewarded for their performance. This would indicate that those respondents who were very certain about being given some type of reward for their performance perceived a high degree of equity whereas those teachers who had little or no certainty about being rewarded perceived little equity in the system.

An analysis of the open-ended responses was achieved by categorizing as closely as possible the responses of the interviewees. The "stayers" in both districts I and II stated most frequently that working with children was the primary reason they remained in teaching. Satisfaction with their work and academic freedom respectively were the next most common responses of the stayers. Table 7 shows a breakdown of the responses of all the stayers.

TABLE 7

REASONS STAYERS IN DISTRICTS I AND II REMAIN IN TEACHING

Reason	Frequency
Working with students	22
Satisfaction with their work	17
Academic Freedom	5
Good Salary	4
Security	2
TOTAL	50

The "leavers" in both districts had a much greater variety of answers to the question, "Why did you leave teaching?" The most common responses were low salary, poor administration or another position with greater opportunities. Table 8 presents an analysis of the responses of the "leavers".

TABLE 8

REASONS LEAVERS IN DISTRICTS I AND II LEFT TEACHING

REASON	FREQUENCY
Low Salary	10
Poor Administration of the school	6
Dislike the students	5
Going into College Teaching	4
Going into Administration	4
Did not enjoy subject he taught	3
Low status of a teacher	3
Did not enjoy grade he taught	2
No Reason	8
TOTAL	45

Those who remain in teaching cited intrinsic job factors as reasons for remaining in the profession. However, those leaving the profession emphasized factors extrinsic to the job itself.

CONCLUSIONS AND REFORMULATION

It must be kept in mind that all of the findings apply only to the two school districts studied. Hypothesis I was confirmed when the null form of the hypothesis was rejected at the .0001 level. "Stayers" perceive greater equity than do the "leavers" in both schools I and II. Adams maintains that there can be little doubt that inequity results in dissatisfaction. He notes that the presence of inequity in an individual creates "tension" in him. The tension is proportional to the magnitude of inequity present. Second, the tension created in an individual will motivate him to eliminate it. In short, the presence of inequity will motivate and individual to achieve equity or reduce inequity and the strength of motivation will vary directly with the magnitude of inequity experienced. Sixteen teachers who left teaching in both districts I and II were using a means to reduce their inequity.

This particular means of reducing inequity was postulated by Festinger in his work with cognitive dissonance. Leaving the field may take any of several ways of severing social relationships. Quitting a job, obtaining a transfer, and absenteeism are common forms of leaving the field in an employment situation. Although Festinger suggests that these are fairly radical means of coping with inequity, the probability of using them is assumed to increase with magnitude of inequity and to decrease with the availability of other means. [17]

Data substantiating the occurance of leaving the field as a mode of reducing inequity were also found by Thibaut. He observed in an experimental situation that low-status team members withdrew from games as it became increasingly clear what their fate was and they felt injustices mounted. [18]

Hypothesis 1 concurs with theories of equity and cognitive dissonance. Teachers who remain in their position perceive little injustice in the opportunities for being rewarded in their school system. This group may be comparing themselves to teachers in other schools which do not have all the opportunities for rewards as schools I and II. Adams argues that changing the object of comparison is a means of reducing inequity.

The "leavers" however, may be using a person in industry with a similar amount of training as a reference for their comparison. If this is the case, their degree of inequity would probably greatly increase since salary levels of teachers is still less than engineers, accountants and lawyers. Hypothesis 2 was confirmed when the null of the hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level. "Stayers" at type II school perceived a significantly higher degree of equity than "stayers" do

at type I school. This might suggest that since district II had a more differentiated reward structure for advancement within the classroom, teachers perceived a higher degree of equity in comparison to teachers in district I. Spector, in a study of the military, found that the "high expectations non-promotion" group of soliders had lower morale and was less satisfied than was the "low expectations nonpromotion" group. [19] This study might provide some understandings as to the differences in perceived equity between the teachers in both districts I and II. These results may also be explained by using the concept of distributive justice as developed by Homans. [20] According to him, distributive justice among men who are in an exchange relationship with one another occurs when the profits of each are proportional to their investments. Profit consists of that which is received in the exchange, less cost incurred. A cost is that which is given up in the exchange, such as foregoing the rewards obtainable in another exchange. Investments in an exchange are the relative attributes that are brought by a party to the exchange. They include, for example, skill, effort, education, training, experience, age and sex according to Homans. Schematically, for a dyad consisting of A and B, distributive justice between them is realized when

$$\frac{\text{A's rewards less A's costs}}{\text{A's investments}} = \frac{\text{B's rewards less B's costs}}{\text{B's investments}}$$

When an inequality between the proportions exists, the participants to the exchange will experience a feeling of injustice. The party specifically experiencing relative deprivation is the one for whom that ratio of profits to investments is smaller.

Since the "stayers" in both districts I and II have made approximately the

same investments as far as educational attainment, length of service, amount of graduate work and teaching level is concerned, one would predict that unless the rewards in both districts were comparable, a feeling of injustice would be present in the less reward environment. This study appears to confirm this assumption.

In addition to the hypotheses studied, additional findings evolved from the study. A significant correlation was found between the positive rating of a teacher by his principal and the teachers' perceived equity.

Teachers who were rated above average in performance by their principals perceived a high degree of equity in their positions. While those teachers who had been rated as below average in their performance perceived a very low degree of equity or high degree of inequity.

Although there have been no studies to link supervisor's rating with perceived equity, there have been several studies which seem quite relevant to this finding. In a study by Hoppock, it was found that satisfied teachers more frequently said they were making a success of their job than dissatisfied teachers.[21] In another study by Gurin, Veroff, and Feld of a national sample of employed men, it was found that job satisfaction was positively related to workers reports of their adequacy.[22]

Likert has suggested that the relationship between satisfaction and performance becomes more positive as the level of skill required by the job increases.[23]

Since teachers who were rated high tended to perceive a high degree of equity in the system, the following relationship might be studied in the future:

(A) Perceived equity is directly related to job performance.

The respondents were also asked about the certainly they had of being rewarded for their performance. In district II, 59% of the respondents indicated that there was a great deal of certainty on their part for being rewarded for their performance. This compared to only 30% in district I.

A significant correlation was found between degree of certainty of receiving any type of reward and perceived equity. Those teachers who were quite certain about being rewarded perceived a high degree of equity. While those teachers who were uncertain about being rewarded perceived a low degree of equity.

March and Simon contend that an individual's uncertainty of the probability distributions connecting behavior choices and environmental outcomes will lead to individual conflict within an organization. The individual will first increase his search for clarification of the uncertainty. Failing in that, he will increase his search for new alternatives. [24]

Bass hypothesizes the following, " a group is more attractive, the greater the rewards which may be earned by membership in the group and the greater the anticipation or expectancy of earning them." [25]

Sirota found a positive correlation between promotional expectations and satisfaction. That is, a person's evaluation of his present position was directly related to his expectations regarding promotion. Therefore, Sirota concludes, many individuals report what they believe their chances are for a promotion before they received information concerning the final awarding of these promotions. Consequently, a positive association between expectation and satisfaction would

be predicted. 26

About twice as many teachers in district II indicated there was a high degree of certainty of being rewarded on their performance as compared to district I. Certainty of being rewarded was directly associated with perceived equity. The following proposition might be investigated in future studies.

(B) There is a direct relationship between the certainty of being rewarded for performance and perceived equity.

An analysis of the item means resulted in some rather interesting findings. For the "stayers" in both districts I and II the items that had the greatest effect on their decision to remain in teaching were that of "satisfaction with teaching" and "earning a good salary." For this same group the factors which had the least influence in their decision to remain in teaching were "being promoted on seniority" and "associating with the top administrators" in the school district. On an open-ended response, the "stayers" cited satisfaction with teaching and working with students as the reasons why they remain in the profession.

For the "leavers", the items which had the greatest effect on their decision to leave were being able to earn a good salary and obtaining economic security provided by pay plus fringe benefits. The items which had the least effect were grade level taught and promotion based on seniority. On the open-ended response low salary and poor administration of the school were cited as reasons why they left the profession.

The "stayers" cited intrinsic job factors whereas the "leavers" cited most frequently extrensic job factors which affected their decision to either remain in or leave teaching. These findings are quite similar to those of Herzberg,

Mausner and Snyderman in their investigations into the sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction of accountants and engineers.[27] They attribute these findings to the fact that the favorable job-content factors such as the work itself and achievement tend to produce satisfaction, but their absence does not tend to produce dissatisfaction. However, the unfavorable job-context factors like salary and administration tend to produce dissatisfaction, but their absence does not produce satisfaction. In effect, this explanation asserts a nonlinearity in the effects of job-context and job-content variables on job satisfaction. Increases in some desirable job-context variable will result in an increase in job satisfaction to the point where the worker is indifferent or neutral concerning the job. Increases, in some desirable job-content variable are required to further increase the worker's job satisfaction to a positive level.

In an attempt to reformulate the present study, theories of equity, cognitive dissonance and job satisfaction appeared quite useful. In an exchange relationship, perceived injustice could be a response to a discrepancy between what is perceived to be and what is perceived should be. Using the terms of Festinger's theory of cognitive dissonance, Patchen postulates that workers making wage comparisons make cognitive relations of the following type:

$$\frac{\text{My Pay}}{\text{His Pay}} \quad \text{compared to} \quad \frac{\text{My position on dimensions related to pay}}{\text{His position on dimensions related to pay}}$$ [28]

This relationship appears to make some sense of the results of the open-ended responses. Teachers who remained in teaching cited the opportunity to earn a good salary as an important reason why they remain in teaching. It appears that the "stayers" may have a different referent group than the "leavers" when making salary

comparisons. The "stayers" may be comparing their salaries to teachers in other districts or to individuals not possessing a college degree. If this were the case, then their salaries as teachers probably appeared quite attractive to them. The "leavers", however, mentioned low salary as the reason they left teaching. Since all the teachers in the study had approximately the same salary range, it would appear that the "leavers" have a different reference group when making salary comparision. It seems plausible that the "leavers" compare their salary schedules to those of their peers in industry who have the same level of education and experience. This assumption could be an explanation to the findings of the study. Since the "leavers" appear to have a social comparison group which is of a higher socio-economic status than teachers, they have left the profession in order to modify their perceived inequity. For future studies the following hypothesis related to social comparison might be investigated:

(C) Degree of perceived equity will be inversely associated with the socio-economic status of the comparison group.

The assumption concurs with the conceptualization proposed by Adams. He suggests that the resolution of inequity by changing comparison person is undoubtedly difficult to accomplish. In the initial stages of comparison processes, as when a man first comes on the job, it probably is relatively easy to choose as comparison other individuals who provide the most equitable comparison. [29] In a study of choice of wage comparison, Patchen asked oil refinery workers to name someone whose yearly earnings were different from theirs and then proceeded to ask them questions about the resulting wage comparisons and about their satisfaction with them. Of the workers who named someone earning

more than they, 60% indicated satisfaction with the comparison and only 17% reported dissatisfaction. Among those who were satisfied, 44% stated they were satisfied because they had finanical advantages, i.e. compensating incomes, and 55% indicated satisfaction with the upward comparison because the person with higher earnings had more education, skill, experience, seniority and the like, i.e. higher inputs. Patchen's data may be recast and reanalyzed to make a different point.[30]

The above findings is similar to Sayles' but more explicit, for dimensions related to pay are specified as being attributes such as skill, education and seniority.[31] These are clearly the same as Homans' investments. Patchen differs somewhat from Homans in his conceptualization, however, in that he also includes job interest among his "dimensions" related to pay. This is not much of an investment as it is a reward, either with positive or negative valence. According to Patchen, when an inequity results from the comparison of the two proportions, cognitive dissonance is experienced. However, dissonance and the attendant dissatisfaction are not necessarily an unfavorable state of affairs from the points of the individual. Brehm points this out in an interesting departure from dissonance theory. Although constant comparisons may be satisfying, they provide no basis for mobility aspirations, whereas dissonant comparisons unfavorable to the individual permits a person to perceive that he is more deserving of higher pay or status.[32]

The "stayers" at one point during their teaching careers may have experienced a high degree of perceived inequity. However, they may have distorted their inputs and outputs in order to reduce this inequity, according to cognitive dissonance theory, individuals do modify or rearrange their cognitions in an effort to reduce perceived incongruities. Since it has been postulated that the experience of inequity is equivalent to the experience of dissonance, it is reason-

able to believe that cognitive distortion may be adopted as a means of reducing inequity. If, for example, socio-economic status were a relevant input, its relative importance could be changed to bring about less perceived inequity. A teacher could convince himself that socio-economic status was either more or less important than he thought originally.

1. National Education Association Research Division, Economic Status of Teachers in 1965-66, Research Division, 1966-R7, Washington, D. C.: The Association, May 1966.

2. J. Scott Hunter, The Beginning Teacher, One Year Later: Report of a Follow-up Study, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, OE23034 Washington D. C.. 1964.

3. National Education Association Research Division, Teacher Supply and Demand in the Public Schools, 1966 Research Report, 1966-R16, Washington D. C.: The Association.

4. Glen Durflinger, "Recruitment and Selection of Prospective Elementary Teachers," Review of Educational Research, (October 1963), p. 355.

5. Ward S. Mason The Beginning Teacher Circular No. 644, U. S. Department of Health Education and Welfare, Office of Education, 1961.

6. W. W. Charters, "Some Obvious Facts About the Teaching Career," Educational Administration Quarterly, (Spring 1967), p. 193

7. M. Patchen, The Choice of Wage Comparisons (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1961).

8. G. C. Homans, Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World), 1961.

9. J. S. Adams, "Toward an Understanding of Inequity, " Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology. 67 (1963). pp. 422-436.

10. Talcott Parsons and Neil J. Smelser, Economy and Society (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956), pp. 10-14.

11. Peter M. Blau, Exchange and Power in Social Life (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964), pp. 88-114.

12. E. Jacques, Equitable Payment (New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc, 1961), p. 132.

13. A. Zaleznik, C. Christensen and F. J. Roethlisberger, The Motivation Productivity and Satisfaction of Workers, A Prediction Study (Boston: Harvard University, Graduate School of Business Administration, 1958).

14. Donald C. Pelz and Frank M. Andrews. Scientists in Organizations (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966).

15. M. A. Howell, G. B. Brumbeck, S. H. Newman and J. P. Rizzo, "Work Satisfaction and the Retention of Organization Employed Physicians," Personnel Psychology, 21 (1968), pp. 63-77.

16. Adams, op.cit., p. 243.

17. L. Festinger, A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance (Evanston, Illinois: Row Peterson, 1957).

18. J. Thibaut, "An Experimental Study of the Cohesiveness of Underprivileged Groups, "Human Relations, 3 (1950), p. 251-278.

19. A. J. Spector, "Expectations, Fulfillment and Morale, "Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 52 (1956), pp. 51-56.

20. Homans, op. cit., p. 242.

21. R. Hoppock, Job Satisfaction (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1935).

22. G. Gurin, J. Veroff and S. Feld, Americans View Their Mental Health (New York: Basic Books, 1960).

23. Rensis Likert, New Patterns of Management (New York: McGraw Hill, 1961).

24. James March and Herbert Simon, Organizations (New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1958), p. 95.

25. B. M. Bass, Leadership, Psychology and Organizational Behavior (New York: Harper, 1960), p. 60.

26. D. Sirota, "Some Effects of Promotional Frustration on Employees Understanding of and Attitudes Toward Management, "Sociometry, 22 (1959). pp. 273-278.

27. F. Herzberg, B. Mausner and B. Snyderman. The Motivation to Work. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1959.

28. M. Patchen, The Choice of Wage Comparisons (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1961), p. 9.

29. J. S. Adams, op.cit., p. 294,

30. M. Patchen, op.cit., p. 12.

31. L. R. Sayles, Behavior of Industrial Work Groups Prediction and Control (New York: John Wiley and Sons. 1958), p. 98.

32. W. J. Brehm and A. R. Cohen, Explorations in Cognitive Dissonance (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962).